DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 2/01/2011 to

application filed on 12/31/03.

2.   Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-20, 22-28, 31-33 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11 and 20 are

independent claims.

3.   There are two sets of rejections in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1, 3-5, 9-11, 13-14, 17-20, 22-23, 26-28, 31-33 remain rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being Unpatentable over <u>Goodisman</u> et al., US 2002/0069223 A1, published

06/06/02 in view of <u>Golovchinsky</u> et al., US 2004/0078757, filed 08/31/2001.

Regarding independent claim 1, Goodisman teaches the steps of:

-    locating a text reference in a source document using a trained statistical model of text

formatting or lexical cues (Goodisman, [0052], [0053], parsing a document into text

blocks, wherein a text block includes one or more object, the parsing based on format

elements including HTML or XML tags, or textual elements including sentences,

questions, line breaks, spaces, hyphens, dashes, strings of digits, strings of letters,

groups of words, or images, icons, etc.);

- identifying a target document related to the text reference (Goodisman, [0039], [0052], [0053], [0059]; identifying a target document related to the text block that includes the object);

- deriving anchor text corresponding to the target document using the located text reference in the source document (Goodisman, fig.6; [0053], [0056]; obtaining and modifying the label to a highlighted/underlined hyperlink, such as highlighted/underlined name "JohnSmith" hyperlink in the document; linking the highlighted/underlined text reference to the target document when the hyperlink is activated/selected);

- generating a hyperlink to the target document (Goodisman, [0053], [0056], [0059]; selecting/clicking the object causing retrieving and displaying the target document); and

- associated the hyperlink with the anchor text (Goodisman, [0053], [0056]; automatically associating the hyperlink with the name "JohnSmith" by linkify engine so that selecting/clicking the name "JohnSmith" causing retrieving and displaying the target document).

Goodisman does not teach identifying a target document including performing a search using a search engine wherein the search is based on a query derived from the text reference and selecting the target document from one or more search results identified by the search engine in response to the query.

Golovchinsky teaches identifying a target document relating to text reference including performing a search based on a query derived from the text reference using a search engine and

selecting the target document from one or more search results identified by the search engine in

response to the query (Golovchinsky, [0018], [0067], [0077]; searching for document (target

document) containing references (text reference) to other documents)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Golovchinsky's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to

include a search engine to identify a document relating to the text reference, since the

combination would have searched and provided related documents associated with the hyperlink

to the user.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches comparing text

from the source document with one or more predetermined references (Goodisman, [0053];

pattern matcher includes "linguistic, keyword proximity and word sequence analysis" to identify

a name).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches locating a label

corresponding to the text reference and associating the hyperlink with the label (Goodisman,

fig.6; [0052], [0053], [0056]; locating/establishing a label, such as name "JohnSmith", as an

object for the text block).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Goodisman teaches locating the label

using a trained statistical model of text formatting or lexical cues (Goodisman, [0053]; obtaining

the label, such as name, phone number, social security number based on "linguistic, keyword

proximity and word sequence analysis").

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches wherein the

source document is selected from the group consisting of a Hypertext Markup Language

(HTML) document, a text document, a postscript document, a Portable Document Format (PDF)

document, a PowerPoint document, a Word document, and Excel document and a close-

captioned video (Goodisman, [0030],[0050]).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches the text

reference is reference to one of a paper, article, company, institution, product, search engine,

image, object, or geographical location (Goodisman; [0053]; the text block includes an object).

Regarding claim 31, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches the text

reference is an object, such as name, number, trademark, figure, icon in the document

(Goodisman, [0024]). Golovchinsky teaches identifying text reference is citation in a document

(Golovchinsky, [0016]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Golovchinsky's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to

locate citation in the document, since the combination would have provided related document

associated with objects including citation for the user.

Claims 11, 13-14, 17-19, 32 are for a computer system including a program in a storage

device performing the method of claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, respectively and are rejected under the

same rationale.

Claims 20, 22-23, 26-28, 33 are for a computer readable medium including instructions

performing the method of claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, respectively and are rejected under the same

rationale.

6.   **Claims 6, 15 and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over <u>Goodisman and Golovchinsky</u> **as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of**

<u>Glover</u> **et al., US 2003/0221163 A1, filed 02/03.**

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, Goodisman does not explicitly teach

deriving label anchor text depending on whether the label corresponding to the text reference

precedes or follows a text phrase.

Glover teaches deriving a label anchor text depending on whether the label corresponding

to the text reference precedes or follows a text phrase (Glover, figures 4; [0034]; extended

anchortext (410, 414, 418) are extracted including text references before, after or before and after

label "<u>Yahoo</u>").

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Glover's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to extract

text before, after or surround the label, since the combination would have provided label anchor

text including the label and text surround the label to link to a target document.

Claim 15 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 24 is for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

7.   **Claims 7, 16 and 25 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Goodisman, Golovchinsky and Glover</u> as applied to claim 6 above and further in view of <u>Hennings</u> et al., US 6,763,496 B1, filed 03/31/99.**

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Goodisman does not explicitly teaches the label anchor text is a longest noun phrase extracted from the text phrase following or preceding the label when the label precedes or follows the phrase, respectively.

Hennings teaches anchor text link comprising a phrase, a picture icon, or a phrase and an icon (Hennings, col.2, lines 54-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hennings' teaching into Goodisman and Glover's teaching to extract a phrase before, after the label, since the combination would have provided label anchor text including a phrase before or after the label; or combination of a phrase before or after the label and an the label (object such as icon, image, trademark, identifier).

Claim 16 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 25 is for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

8.   **Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, 13-14, 17-20, 22-23 and 26-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Goodisman</u> et al., US 2002/0069223 A1, published 06/06/02 in view of <u>Kelley</u> et al., US 20080195518, priority filed 09/30/2003.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Goodisman teaches the steps of:

- locating a text reference in a source document using a trained statistical model of text formatting or lexical cues (Goodisman, [0052], [0053], parsing a document into text blocks, wherein a text block includes one or more object, the parsing based on format elements including HTML or XML tags, or textual elements including sentences, questions, line breaks, spaces, hyphens, dashes, strings of digits, strings of letters, groups of words, or images, icons, etc.);

- identifying a target document related to the text reference (Goodisman, [0039], [0052], [0053], [0059]; identifying a target document related to the text block that includes the object);

- deriving anchor text corresponding to the target document using the located text reference in the source document (Goodisman, fig.6; [0053], [0056]; obtaining and modifying the label to a highlighted/underlined hyperlink, such as highlighted/underlined name "JohnSmith" hyperlink in the document; linking the

highlighted/underlined text reference to the target document when the hyperlink is

activated/selected);

- generating a hyperlink to the target document (Goodisman, [0053], [0056], [0059];

  selecting/clicking the object causing retrieving and displaying the target document);

  and

- associated the hyperlink with the anchor text (Goodisman, [0053], [0056];

  automatically associating the hyperlink with the name "JohnSmith" by linkify engine

  so that selecting/clicking the name "JohnSmith" causing retrieving and displaying the

  target document).

Goodisman does not teach identifying a target document including performing a search

using a search engine in which the search is based on a query derived from the text reference and

selecting the target document from one or more search results responsive to the query.

Kelley teaches identifying a target document relating to text reference including

performing a search using a search engine in which the search is based on a query derived from

the text reference and selecting the target document from one or more search results responsive

to the query (Kelley, fig.4, [0030], [0033]; searching relevant documents based on keywords and

selecting the most relevant documents).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Kelley's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to include a

search engine to identify a document relating to the text reference, since the combination would

have searched and provided related documents in order to associate with the hyperlink to the

user.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches comparing text from the source document with one or more predetermined references (Goodisman, [0053]; pattern matcher includes "linguistic, keyword proximity and word sequence analysis" to identify a name).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches locating a label corresponding to the text reference and associating the hyperlink with the label (Goodisman, fig.6; [0052], [0053], [0056]; locating/establishing a label, such as name "JohnSmith", as an object for the text block).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Goodisman teaches deriving the label using a trained statistical model of text formatting or lexical cues (Goodisman, [0053]; obtaining the label, such as name, phone number, social security number based on "linguistic, keyword proximity and word sequence analysis").

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches wherein the source document is selected from the group consisting of a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) document, a text document, a postscript document, a Portable Document Format (PDF) document, a PowerPoint document, a Word document, and Excel document and a close-captioned video (Goodisman, [0030],[0050]).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches the text

reference is reference to one of a paper, article, company, institution, product, search engine,

image, object, or geographical location (Goodisman; [0053]; the text block includes an object)

Claims 11, 13-14 and 17-19 are for a computer system including a program in a storage

device performing the method of claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, respectively and are rejected under the

same rationale.

Claims 20, 22-23 and 26-28 are for a computer readable medium including instructions

performing the method of claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, respectively and are rejected under the same

rationale.

9.   **Claims 6, 15 and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Goodisman and Kelley as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of Glover et al.,

US 2003/0221163 A1, filed 02/03.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, Goodisman does not explicitly teach

deriving label anchor text depending on whether the label corresponding to the text reference

precedes or follows a text phrase.

Glover teaches deriving label anchor text depending on whether the label corresponding

to the text reference precedes or follows a text phrase (Glover, figures 4; [0034]; extended

anchortext (410, 414, 418) are extracted including text references before, after or before and after

label "Yahoo").

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Glover's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to extract text before, after or surround the label, since the combination would have provided label anchor text including the label and text surround the label to link to a target document.

Claim 15 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 24 is for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

10.   **Claims 7, 16 and 25 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Goodisman, Kelley and Glover</u> as applied to claim 6 above and further in view of <u>Hennings</u> et al., US 6,763,496 B1, filed 03/31/99.**

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Goodisman does not explicitly teaches the label anchor text is a longest noun phrase extracted from the text phrase following or preceding the label when the label precedes or follows the phrase, respectively.

Hennings teaches anchor text link comprising a phrase, a picture icon, or a phrase and an icon (Hennings, col.2, lines 54-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hennings' teaching into Goodisman and Glover's teaching to extract a phrase before, after the label, since the combination would have provided

label anchor text including a phrase before or after the label; or combination of a phrase before

or after the label and an the label (object such as icon, image, trademark, identifier).

Claim 16 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under

the same rationale.

Claim 25 is for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the

method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

11.   Claims 31-33 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Goodisman and Kelley as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of

Golovchinsky et al., US 2004/0078757, filed 08/31/2001.

Regarding claims 31-33, which is dependent on claims 1, 11, 20, Goodisman teaches the

text reference is an object, such as name, number, trademark, figure, icon in the document

(Goodisman, [0024]). Golovchinsky teaches identifying text reference is citation in a document

(Golovchinsky, [0016]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Golovchinsky's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to

locate citation in the document, since the combination would have provided related document

associated with objects including citation for the user.

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-20, 22-30 have been

considered but are not persuasive.

Applicants primarily ague with respect to claims independent claims 1, 11, 20 that

Golovchinsky does not teaches "trained statistical model" (Remarks, page 10).

This is not persuasive. Goodisman teaches locating the text reference in a document

(Goddisman, [0052]; dividing the document into text blocks using a parser). Goodisman also

teaches parsing the document into text blocks based on format elements including HTML or

XML tags, or textual elements including sentences, questions, line breaks, spaces, hyphens,

dashes, strings of digits, strings of letters, groups of words, or images, icons, etc. (Goodisman,

[0053]). Therefore, when the parser receives different document format elements and/or textual

elements in the document, different text blocks are located based on an algorithm computation of

the parser (trained statistical model).

Conclusion

12.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to THU V. HUYNH whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Cesar B. Paula can be reached on (571) 272-4128. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thu Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2177
April 6, 2011